

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner has rejected Applicants' claims under 35 USC 112 for the language describing the housing as a one-piece member or as not supported by the specification. The newly presented claims now describe the housing as comprising a single build-up element which is the language used in the specification.

The newly presented claims further describe the electronics unit received in a hollow formed in the build-up element which electronics perform the dual function of operating the power fold actuator and the mirror adjustment actuator mechanisms.

The Examiner has rejected Applicants' claims over a proposed combination of the teachings of the patent to Huizenga et al and those of the patent to Fuerst et al. It is noted that neither of the cited references is related to a power fold mirror and therefore, the problem of operating an actuator for power folding is not present.

Applicants' newly presented claims describe the housing as comprising a single build-up element with reinforcing members molded therein. It is noted that although the Huizenga et al patent utilizes molded electrical conductors there is no teaching of using same for the function of reinforcing and increasing the rigidity and stiffness.

Furthermore, the proposed combination of the teachings of Fuerst with those of Huizenga would still fail to teach the combining of the electronics for controlling both the power fold actuator and the mirror adjustment actuator into a single unit disposed in a hollow of the single build-up element of the housing. Therefore, it is submitted that the Examiner's proposed combination of the references does not support a rejection of the claims. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection be withdrawn and the newly presented claims allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Roger A. Johnston
Registration No.: 25,880
Attorney for Applicant

Eaton Corporation
1111 Superior Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2584
(216) 523-4132